



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/648,600

08/25/2003

Namit Jain

50277-2235

4275

42425

7590

09/10/2010

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE

2055 GATEWAY PLACE

SUITE 550

SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1083

EXAMINER

RADTKE, MARK A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/10/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/648,600	JAIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MARK A. X RADTKE	2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 02 September 2010 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☒ entered in part. See explanation below.

First, it is noted that Applicant incorrectly refers to claim 13 on page 7 of the instant Reply. Reference to claim 13 has been interpreted as reference to claim 12.

Applicant's amendment to claim 1 is entered because it does not affect the scope of the invention.

The Examiner is not persuaded that the proposed amendments to claim 12 should be entered. The amendment in question deletes the limitation upon which the BPAI decision was based. See pages 6-7 of the Decision filed 28 May 2010. At the very least, the amendment requires more than a cursory review of the record. See MPEP 714.16(I). Entry of the proposed amendment to claim 12 is disapproved.

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165